DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 340 371 IR 053 863

AUTHOR Springer, John A.
TITLE The Effect on Faculty Research of Theft and Mutilation of Library Materials in an Academic Library: A Study in Perception.
PUB DATE Jul 91
NOTE 37p.; Master's Thesis, Kent State University.
PUB TYPE Dissertations/Theses - Masters Theses (042) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *College Libraries; Higher Education; Hypothesis Testing; *Library Materials; Library Services; Questionnaires; Research Problems; *Stealing; *Teacher Attitudes; User Satisfaction (Information); *Vandalism
IDENTIFIERS Kent State University OH

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire study assessed 143 faculty members at Kent State University to determine if the problem of theft and mutilation of library materials causes faculty members to view the library as well as the miscreants responsible for this behavior in a negative light. It is hypothesized that a majority of faculty members responding to the survey will not perceive that their research has been significantly affected by the theft and mutilation of library materials. Additionally, it is hypothesized that they will perceive that the library is doing enough to deter and prevent the theft and mutilation of library materials. Both hypotheses are supported by the results, although a substantial number of subjects (19.6%) reported that theft and mutilation of library materials has had a substantial effect on their research. A high number of faculty (20.6%) also reported that, because of theft and mutilation of library materials, the library is so inconvenient that they sometimes avoid going there. Further research is recommended to explore the political ramifications of these feelings on the part of faculty members. A copy of the survey questionnaire is appended. (13 references) (DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED340371

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

THE EFFECT ON FACULTY RESEARCH OF THEFT AND MUTILATION OF LIBRARY MATERIALS IN AN ACADEMIC LIBRARY: A STUDY IN PERCEPTION

A Master's Research Paper submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for Masters of Library Science
at Kent State University

by

John A. Springer

July, 1991

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

John A. Springer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

IR053863

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ABSTRACT

A questionnaire study assessed 143 faculty members at Kent State University to determine if the problem of theft and mutilation of library materials causes faculty members to view the library as well as the miscreants responsible for this behavior in a negative light. It is hypothesized that a majority of faculty members responding to the survey will not perceive that their research has been significantly affected by the theft and mutilation of library materials. Additionally, it is hypothesized that they will perceive that the library is doing enough to deter and prevent the theft and mutilation of library materials.

Both hypotheses are supported by the results. A substantial number of subjects (19.6%) reported that theft and mutilation of library materials has had a substantial affect on their research. A high number (20.6%) also reported that because of theft and mutilation of library materials, the library is so inconvenient that they sometimes avoid going there. Further research is recommended so that the political ramifications of these feelings on the part of faculty members can be explored.

12053863

Master's Research Paper by

John A. Springer

B.A., Emory University, 1983

M.L.S., Kent State University, 1991

Approved by

Adviser Lois Buttlar Date 7-19-91

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Approval page.....ii

List of Tables.....iv

Introduction.....1

Purpose of the Study.....2

Definition of Terms.....3

Limitations of the Study.....3

Review of the Literature.....4

Methodology.....12

Results.....14

Conclusion.....22

Appendix A: Questionnaire.....23

Appendix B: Cover Letter.....27

References.....28

Bibliography.....30

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Summary of Behavioral Questions.....15

Table 2: Frequency of encountering missing or mutilated items.....16

Table 3: Summary of Perception Questions.....21

INTRODUCTION

Previous research has shown that theft and mutilation of library periodicals and monographs are expensive and time consuming to rectify. The average loss rate for an academic library is 1% per year.[1] One study performed at a major academic library estimated that the library had lost approximately 30% of it's collection to theft.[2] This translates into approximately $270,000 in materials alone. More importantly, surveys have shown that the overwhelming majority of library patrons have, at least once, been inconvenienced by this destruction. This not only reflects badly on the library, but may cause delays in vital patron research.

The author became interested in this issue when inconvenienced in his own research by encountering an article that had been ripped out of a journal. The first thought that occurred was "Who would do such a thing?" The second was "How can the library allow this to happen?"

The first question was answered by consulting the body of research that has been done on this topic, which will be discussed later in this paper. The second question was less easy to answer. Obviously, libraries take steps to minimize losses due to theft and mutilation of materials. After all,

these materials must usually be replaced at significant cost to the library in terms of both money and personnel hours. Many libraries spend a significant amount of time and money trying not to allow this to happen.

Why, then, should the library be blamed for this incident? The relevant literature was searched. It was determined that nothing had been done to survey users' attitudes regarding the theft and mutilation of library materials. Librarians spend a good deal of time and energy promoting the use of the library. They also are quite concerned about the image of the library and of librarians.

Purpose of the Study

The primary mission of the library in an academic setting is to support the curriculum. Since faculty are, for the most part, responsible for the curriculum, it was decided to survey this group. It was assumed that faculty members could have a more adverse impact on the library if they hold negative attitudes. The purpose of the study is to see if the problem of theft and mutilation of library materials causes patrons to view the library as well as the miscreants responsible for this behavior in a negative light.

It is hypothesized that a majority of faculty members responding to the survey will not perceive that their

research has been significantly affected by the theft and mutilation of library materials. Additionally, it is hypothesized that they will perceive that the library is doing enough to deter and prevent the theft and mutilation of library materials.

Definition of Terms

For the purpose of this study, theft is defined as the unauthorized removal of library materials from the library. Mutilation is defined either as the ripping, tearing or cutting of pages from a monographic or serial publication, or as the defacing of any library material so as to render it unusable or limit it's usefulness.

Limitations of the Study

The results of this study should not be generalized to faculty members at all academic libraries, as the survey was only conducted at Kent State University, Kent, Ohio. Nor should the results of this be generalized to students.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Perhaps the most important research performed in the area of theft and mutilation of library materials is the landmark study performed at Kent State University in 1974 by Clyde Hendrick and Marjorie Murfin.[3] A questionnaire was administered to college students in an attempt to determine characteristics of mutilators, what percentage of the sample had mutilated library materials, reasons for and circumstances surrounding mutilation, and to explore deterrent measures as reported by the students.

Incredibly, approximately 74% of subjects reported having been inconvenienced at least once by mutilated materials. Approximately 8% of the sample reported having torn pages from books or periodicals. Students did not consider mutilation of library materials to be a severe offense. Over half of the violators estimated that it took three days to one week to replace an article at a cost of $0.25. These figures are gross underestimates. Results of the survey suggest that mutilation rates may be reduced through a publicity campaign.

In general, student attitudes about the library were positive. However, three times as many violators as non-violators felt they had been treated unfairly by the

library. A large majority of violators thought that copy machines were too expensive. A minority of non-violators believed this. Almost all violators realized that they were inconveniencing others by their behavior.

Students responded that a penalty warning sign would act as an effective deterrent. It was impossible to separate violators from non-violators demographically. The occurrence of mutilation was due to situational circumstances. Excerpts from interviews with violators are included.

Murfin and Hendrick followed this study in 1975 with a report on interviews that they had conducted with students who had admitted to theft or mutilation in the previous study.[4] Three students who had admitted to mutilating periodicals in a previous research paper were interviewed. The most popular place to mutilate was in a study carrel with a penknife. There was a marked perceived difference between bound and unbound periodicals. Bound periodicals were much less likely to be mutilated. A marked difference in attitude was observed when the students were informed about the actual cost of mutilation.

The students reported being angry that articles had been ripped out, and, ironically, gave this as a contributing cause of their behavior. They were hostile toward the library. Two students had a high grade point average, and reported feeling pressure to succeed. Both

reported using the library daily to weekly. They attributed their behavior to the circumstance of being rushed at closing time. Both reported that if they had known actual replacement time and costs, they would not have mutilated. The third student reported that her behavior was caused by a lack of concern for others. Her grade point average was lower.

Terri Petersen built upon the work done at Kent by Murfin and Hendrick.[3] The purpose was to better understand the reasons theft and destruction of materials occur. There is a lack of scholarly research on this subject. An attempt was made to determine why and how mutilation and theft occur, who among library users is more likely to steal or mutilate, and to survey users about what they think might be effective preventative measures.

It was hypothesized that these behaviors might occur due to hostility toward the library, ignorance regarding replacement costs, lack of consideration for others, or lack of concern about the consequences.

An anonymous questionnaire was used. The population was 5,134 students at a public university. The questionnaire was administered to 5% of the population during class periods. Violators totaled 12% of the sample. A majority of violators was unconcerned about getting caught while stealing.

Only one third of the sample reported never having been inconvenienced by missing material. A majority of violators had never been affected in this manner. Violators were more likely to think that a higher percentage of students was involved in this activity than was found to be the case. Almost two thirds of the respondents believed that the availability of free photocopy service would deter these behaviors.

Potential violators cannot be identified in the library setting. Theft and mutilation are attributed to grade pressure on students. Further research is recommended in the area of evaluating preventative measures after they have been implemented.

A study performed by Dana Weiss in 1981* was also heavily influenced by the work of Hendrick and Murfin. It was found that the major difference between those students who stole and/or mutilated library materials and those who did not was that violators generally had a higher grade point average than non-violators. This was attributed to motivation to succeed at any cost. The study was conducted through the use of a questionnaire survey.

The questionnaire survey revealed that there was no relationship between stealing and satisfaction with library service. Most respondents did not believe that there was any danger of being caught stealing. Students who were more able

to find what they needed in the library were more likely to steal. They did not steal things other than library materials. Students did not steal materials because of expense or inconvenience incurred through the use of copying machines. More copy machines had no effect.

Students who mutilated materials also considered stealing them. Theft and mutilation were premeditated. Students reported that stealing and mutilating were done by students behaving selfishly in anonymity.

The most important study to be performed recently is the bibliometric study conducted by Mitsuko Collver at the State University of New York at Stony Brook.[7] The SUNY Stony Brook Library has maintained a "Ripoff File" containing replacement copies of articles that were reported to librarians as having been ripped out of bound periodicals. It was found that social science journals were the most heavily affected. Within the social sciences, psychology journals were the most mutilated. Humanities journals were less heavily used. Within the social sciences, rates of mutilation were positively correlated with the number of students enrolled in various programs. Overall, 9% of all journal titles were affected.

Another bibliometric study was conducted in 1980 by Mary Noel Gourke and Marjorie Murfin.[8] They tried to judge the effectiveness of a publicity campaign on deterring

mutilation of periodicals in a large research library. The campaign decreased mutilation by approximately 25%. Bound volumes of periodicals were more likely to be mutilated if they had been previously damaged. An attempt was made to quantify losses in terms of extent and dollar amount. Solutions to the problem are explored.

An earlier study showed the rate of mutilation as approximately 15% of the current issues. In bound periodicals, mutilation rates among popular titles ran as high as 100%. Based on these figures, replacement costs were estimated.

A public relations campaign was implemented. Afterwards, another bibliometric study was completed. It was found that the rate of mutilation had fallen by approximately 25%. The second study also found that those issues that had been found to be damaged in the first study were more heavily damaged than those that were not.

A bibliometric study was performed at Youngstown State University in 1990 by Thomas Atwood and Carol Wall.* They found a substantially lower rate of mutilation than Collver found at SUNY Stony Brook. Procedures to deter and prevent mutilation were found to be adequate, and will be continued. However, it is important to note that the researchers were prompted to perform the study because of an editorial in the university newspaper decrying the sorry state of the

periodical collection. The article concludes that greater attention should be focused on students' perceptions of the periodicals collection.

These articles represent the best and the majority of scholarly research on this topic. The remainder of the literature on the subject takes the form of essays. Several of these essays are worth mentioning because they are provocative and insightful.

Perhaps the most provocative of these articles was written by Theodore Hines in 1975.[10] Hines writes that the fact that materials are stolen from libraries is unimportant. It is a signal that the collection is being used, and should be seen as a positive sign. The "loss-to-use ratio" is the major consideration. Ease of use is the primary consideration for the patron. Preventative measures against theft may inconvenience patrons to the point that they no longer use the library.

The article provides many questions for the librarian to ask himself. They are intended to stimulate thought about ease of use, proper customer service, ergonomics, policy and procedure, proactivity, and professionalism.

It is important that libraries not make library use more difficult for honest patrons in their efforts to deter thieves and mutilators.

While patron theft remains the worst of this problem, it is important to remember that library staff may also steal. An article by Alice Harrison Bahr[11] traces a brief history of grand thefts by patrons. Theft by staff members is then discussed. Bahr points out that it has been impossible to draw a profile of patrons that are likely to steal materials from the library. Individual libraries suffer insufficient employee theft to be able to draw a profile of a thieving employee. She recommends that libraries pool their information in order to make up such a profile and devise a testing instrument that may reveal predisposition for such behaviors.

As a result of theft by both patron and staff, Robert Towner writes that the real victim in these crimes is trust.[12] He points out that librarians have deceived themselves about theft of library materials. We are a helping and compassionate group of people and view those responsible as emotionally disturbed rather than as common (or uncommon) thieves. This eloquent article focuses on the human cost of theft rather than on the monetary.

The award for the most amusing and unscientific approach to library theft goes to Bertha R. Almagro[13] who recommends a time honored deterrent method: The Curse-a-Book Security System. Various curses are recommended that can be tailored to the type of library and the subject matter of the item being stolen.

METHODOLOGY

A questionnaire survey was administered to 143 faculty members chosen at random from a directory of faculty members. Only faculty were surveyed because it was assumed that their research would be more heavily affected than that of students. Every tenth faculty member was chosen. The questionnaires utilized a Likert scale in order to judge patrons' attitudes (See appendix A). Questions allowed for five responses ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Questions regarding the frequency of encountering stolen or mutilated materials allowed responses of never, once, twice, three to six and more than six.

Questionnaires were sent through the Campus Mail to faculty members' campus addresses. A self addressed stamped envelope was included so that the subject could easily return the questionnaire through the mail. A cover letter informed the subjects that the study was not being performed by the university libraries, but as research by a student toward a master's degree in library science. However, the university libraries may be informed of the results of the study if they are interested. Subjects were informed that the research paper may be submitted for publication and that results of the study would be available to subjects upon

receipt of a written request by the researcher. Anonymity was assured. The subjects were asked to respond to the questionnaire by a specified date.

Three weeks after the mailing, the results of the survey were analyzed. The percent of respondents was calculated. Responses were recorded and placed in tabular form for comparison. Results of the survey and discussion of those results are written in following sections of the paper.

RESULTS

A disappointing 24% of the sample responded to the survey. It is possible that this low response rate is due to the fact that the survey was conducted over summer semester. Because of the timing of the study, many faculty members to whom the questionnaire was mailed may have been away from their offices and therefore unable to respond. However, the sample is 10% of the population under study. Therefore, the percentage of respondents represents 2.4% of the population under study. All levels of professors, with the exception of University professors are represented in the responses. Full professors accounted for 35.3%, assistant professors accounted for 32.4%, associate professors accounted for 17.6%, instructors accounted for 8.8%, and adjunct professors and emeriti each accounted for 2.9% of the responses.

The questions in the survey are of two types. The first type to be discussed involve ways in which the respondents report that they behave. The second type of question involves the manner in which the library is perceived by the respondents. Responses are displayed in tabular format for easy comparison. Table 1 shows the frequency with which the respondents encountered missing or mutilated materials.

Table 2 is a summary of results of the behavioral questions. Table 3 is a summary of the perception questions. All figures are expressed in terms of percentages.

Behavioral Questions

A full 97% of the responding faculty members reported that they use scholarly journals a great deal in their research. As shown in Table 2, only 20.6% of respondents agreed that they use popular periodicals a great deal for their research.

TABLE 1

SUMMARY OF BEHAVIORAL QUESTIONS

Attitude Item		Response Categories 1+2 Agree	3	4+5 Disagree
1.)	I use professional or scholarly journals a great deal in my research.	97.0	0.0	3.0
2.)	I use popular periodicals a great deal in my research.	20.6	14.7	64.7
4.)	When I cannot find a book on the shelves, I am likely to ask a librarian about it.	79.4	8.8	11.8
6.)	When encountering a torn-out article, I usually tell a librarian about it.	56.2	21.9	21.9
7.)	When encountering a torn-out article, I usually put it back on the shelf without telling anyone about it.	31.2	18.8	50.0

This disparity should not be surprising. The fact that mutilation of popular periodicals occurs more frequently

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

than mutilation of scholarly journals has been documented. This is one reason for the stated hypothesis.

Several results of the survey were found to be somewhat consistent with past research. As has been previously stated, Terri Petersen's study[14] found that only one third of the sample reported never having been inconvenienced by missing material. Hendrick and Murfin[15] reported that 26% of their student sample had not encountered missing materials. The present study found that only 20.6% of the respondents reported that they had never been inconvenienced by missing books or by articles ripped from magazines. As shown in Table 1, the incidence of missing or stolen books was found to be greater than the incidence of ripped articles. Only 32.4% of the respondents reported never having found an article torn from a bound journal. A slim 8.8% reported never having found that a book was lost or stolen from the collection .

TABLE 2

FREQUENCY OF ENCOUNTERING MISSING OR MUTILATED ITEMS

		Response Categories Frequency				
		0	1	2	3-6	>6
3.)	During my research I have found that a book was lost or missing from the library collection:	8.8	20.6	14.7	35.3	20.6
5.)	During my research I have found that an article I needed was missing from a bound volume:	32.4	14.7	26.5	14.3	11.8

This slightly elevated rate in relation to past studies is not surprising. Faculty members are more apt to make extended use of the collection than students. Since the student samples in the previous studies were undergraduates spending at most four years at their respective institutions, it is likely that faculty members who have spent more than four years at their institution would have more opportunity to encounter missing books and stolen articles.

It is logistically impossible for librarians to frequently inventory the entire collection or to peruse the bound periodical collection for mutilation. Therefore, librarians rely substantially on reports of theft and mutilation from patrons. Unfortunately for us, it would seem that we are getting only half of the story. Only 56.2% of the respondents agreed that when they encountered a torn out article, they usually tell a librarian about it. As a check on the accuracy of this response, the next question in the survey asked essentially the same question in the negative. Faculty were asked to agree or disagree with this statement: "When encountering a torn-out article, I usually put it back on the shelf without telling anyone about it." Only 50% of the respondents disagreed with this statement. It is important to remember that these results cannot be

generalized beyond the faculty at this institution. Certainly they cannot be generalized to the library's entire patron population. However, these figures indicate at least two things. Without firm bibliometric evidence, librarians cannot be sure of the extent of damage done to the collection by vandals. In addition, a large number of faculty members have some reason for not reporting the problem of mutilation to library staff. This would seem to indicate a lack of rapport between faculty and library staff. The reasons for this are unclear and call for additional research.

Perception Questions

Two questions were asked relating to the efforts of the Library to prevent and deter theft of books and mutilation of periodicals. As Table 3 indicates, only 20.6% of the sample feel that the library's efforts are insufficient to prevent and deter book theft, while 32.4% believe that the library's efforts are sufficient. More people believe that the library is not doing enough to prevent the mutilation of periodicals. Affirmative responses to this question total 29.4% of the sample. Negative responses total 23.5%. In each case, 47.1% had no opinion on the subject. When averaged, it

is found that exactly 25% believe that the library is not doing enough about this problem.

Four questions were asked to try to determine if subjects perceive a greater need for deterrence and prevention of losses or for replacement of lost materials. Also determined by these questions is whether the subjects think that it is more appropriate for students to pay for increased levels of replacement and prevention through slightly increased tuition or if faculty and staff should pay through slightly smaller salary increases. Interestingly, respondents perceive a greater need for additional efforts on the part of the library for replacement over deterrence and prevention by a margin of 39.4% to 30.8%. Not surprisingly, it is felt that increased efforts should be funded through tuition hikes over smaller pay increases by a margin of 44.6% to 25.8%. It is noteworthy that 25.8% of the sample view the problem as severe enough that they would agree to help pay for it out of their paychecks.

Three questions were asked that were seen to be crucial to the study. The sample was asked if they believe that the theft of books, articles from bound periodicals and articles from current periodicals has significantly affected their research. Almost one in five faculty members (19.6%) respond

that they feel their research has been significantly affected by this problem. The theft of books and articles from bound periodicals was seen as problematic in this regard by 20.6% of the respondents. The problem of theft of articles from current periodicals was only slightly less severe at 17.6%.

The subjects were asked to agree or disagree with the following statement: "Because of missing books and articles, the library is so inconvenient to use that I sometimes avoid going there." The question was designed to measure the way in which faculty perceived the library as a result of theft and mutilation of materials. A remarkably high 20.6% of the respondents agree with this statement. Even more surprising is the fact that 85.7% of those agreeing with this statement are assistant, associate and full professors. Full professors make up the largest portion comprising 42.9% of this group.

More than half of those reporting that they sometimes avoid the library do not agree that theft and mutilation of materials have significantly affected their research. One possible explanation for this may be that they feel they are able to obtain needed research materials through other sources.

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF PERCEPTION QUESTIONS

Attitude Item		Response Categories 1+2 Agree	3	4+5 Disagree
8.)	The theft of books from the library collection has significantly effected my research.	20.6	38.2	41.2
9.)	The theft of articles from current periodicals has significantly effected my research.	17.6	44.1	38.2
10.)	The theft of articles from bound periodicals has significantly effected my research.	20.6	41.2	38.2
11.)	Because of missing books and articles, the library is so inconvenient to use that I sometimes avoid going there.	20.6	14.7	67.6
12.)	The Library doesn't do enough to prevent and deter people from stealing books.	20.6	47.1	32.4
13.)	The Library doesn't do enough to prevent and deter people from ripping articles out of periodicals.	29.4	47.1	23.5
14.)	The library should do more to replace stolen books and articles even if it means a small increase in tuition.	48.5	27.3	24.2
15.)	The library should do more to deter and prevent the theft of books and articles even if it means a small increase in tuition.	40.6	28.1	31.2
16.)	The library should do more to replace stolen books and articles even if it means slightly reduced pay increases for University employees.	30.3	12.1	57.6
17.)	The library should do more to deter and prevent the theft of books and articles even if it means slightly reduced pay increases for University employees.	21.2	21.2	57.6

CONCLUSION

It was hypothesized that a majority of faculty members would not perceive that their research has been significantly affected by the theft and mutilation of library materials. This hypothesis is supported. It was also hypothesized that a majority of faculty members would perceive that the library is doing enough to deter and prevent the theft and mutilation of library materials. This hypothesis is also supported.

It is clear, however, that one cannot be satisfied with properly serving only half of an important segment of users. This study has found that a fifth of faculty members responding to the questionnaire avoid the library as a result of theft and mutilation of library materials. This is a situation that academic librarians cannot accept. Not only would they be underserving a significant portion of users, they are spending their account of good will. Librarians spend a great deal of time and effort promoting the use of the library. It is sad that these efforts are undermined by this problem. Given the position of the disenchanted users within the institution, it could have serious political ramifications. Further research into what these political ramifications might be is needed.

Appendix A

QUESTIONNAIRE

INSTRUCTIONS: Please place an "X" next to the answer that is closest to your opinion. Choose only one answer for each question.

1.) I use professional or scholarly journals a great deal in my research.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

2.) I use popular periodicals a great deal in my research.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

3.) During my research I have found that a book was lost or missing from the library collection:

_____Never
_____Once
_____Twice
_____Three to Six times
_____More than Six times

4.) When I cannot find a book on the shelves, I am likely to ask a librarian about it.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

5.) During my research I have found that an article I needed was missing from a bound volume:

_____Never
_____Once
_____Twice
_____Three to Six times
_____More than Six times

6.) When encountering a torn-out article, I usually tell a librarian about it.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

7.) When encountering a torn-out article, I usually put it back on the shelf without telling anyone about it.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

8.) The theft of books from the library collection has significantly effected my research.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

9.) The theft of articles from current periodicals has significantly effected my research.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

10.) The theft of articles from bound periodicals has significantly effected my research.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

11.) Because of missing books and articles, the library is so inconvenient to use that I sometimes avoid going there.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

12.) The Library doesn't do enough to prevent and deter people from stealing books.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

13.) The Library doesn't do enough to prevent and deter people from ripping articles out of periodicals.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

14.) The library should do more to replace stolen books and articles even if it means a small increase in tuition.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

15.) The library should do more to deter and prevent the theft of books and articles even if it means a small increase in tuition.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

16.) The library should do more to replace stolen books and articles even if it means slightly reduced pay increases for University employees.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

17.) The library should do more to deter and prevent the theft of books and articles even if it means slightly reduced pay increases for University employees.

_____Strongly Agree
_____Somewhat Agree
_____Neither Agree nor Disagree
_____Somewhat Disagree
_____Strongly Disagree

18.) Please identify which type of professor you are:

_____Adjunct
_____Assistant
_____Associate
_____Full
_____Instructor
_____Other_____

Appendix B

School of Library Science
(216) 672-2782

Kent State University
Kent Ohio 44242-0001

June 14, 1991

Dear Kent State University Faculty Member:

You are being asked to participate in a study about the effects of theft and mutilation of library materials on faculty research. Little is known about the extent of this problem. Please find a brief questionnaire enclosed. Your participation in this study will be greatly appreciated.

I am conducting this study in partial fulfillment of the requirements for a Masters Degree in Library Science. The results of this study will be made available to the University Libraries. The completed study may be submitted to professional journals for publication. Results will also be made available to study participants upon request.

Your anonymity will be assured. Therefore, please do not write your name on the questionnaire or include a return address on the return envelope. If you wish to request results of the study, please send your request in a separate envelope instead of including it with your completed questionnaire.

Enclosed please find an envelope for the return of your questionnaire. It should be returned through the campus mail before June 21, 1991 to:

John A. Springer
314 Library

Thank you for your thoughtful participation.

Sincerely,

John A. Springer

Enclosures

REFERENCES

[1]Carol Wall, "Inventory: What You Might expect To Be Missing." Library & Archival Security 7 no.2 (Summer 1985): 27-31.

[2]Larry Greenwood and Harlley McKean, "Effective Measurement and Reduction of Book Loss in an Academic Library." Journal of Academic Librarianship 11 no.5 (1985): 275-83.

[3]Clyde Hendrick and Marjorie E. Murfin, "Project Library Ripoff: A Study of Periodical Mutilation in a University Library," College & Research Libraries 45 (November 1974): 402-11.

[4]Marjorie Murfin and Clyde Hendrick, "Ripoffs Tell Their Story: Interviews With Mutilators in a University Library." Journal of Academic Librarianship 1 (May 1975): 8-12.

[5]Terri Petersen, "Theft and Mutilation of Library Materials," College & Research Libraries 51 (March 1990): 120-8.

[6]Dana Weiss, "Book Theft and Book Mutilation in a Large Urban University Library," College & Research Libraries 42 (July 1981): 341-7.

[7]Mitsuko Collver, "Subsequent Demand for Ripped-Off Journal Articles." Reference Librarian no.27-28 (1989): 347-66.

[8]Mary Noel Gourke, and Marjorie Murfin, "Periodical Mutilation: The Insidious Disease," Library Journal 105 (September 15, 1980): 1795-7.

[9]Thomas Atwood and Carol Wall, "A Case Study of Periodical Mutilation in a University Serials Collection." Library & Archival Security 10 no.1 (1990): 35-41.

[10]Theodore Hines, "Theft, Mutilation, and the Loss-To-Use Ratio," Library Security Newsletter 1 (May 1975): 1-4.

[11]Alice Harrison Bahr, "The Theif in Our Midst." Library & Archival Security 9 no.3-4 (1989): 77-81.

[12]Lawrence W. Towner, "An End to Innocence." American Libraries 19 (March 1988): 210-13.

[13]Bertha R. Almagro, "The Curse-a-Book Security System." Library & Archival Security 7 no.3-4 (Fall/Winter 1985): 49-53.

[14]Petersen, "Theft and Mutilation," 120-8.

[15]Hendrick and Murfin, "Project Library Ripoff," 402-11.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Almagro, Bertha R., "The Curse-a-Book Security System." Library & Archival Security 7 no.3-4 (Fall/Winter 1985): 49-53.

Atwood, Thomas and Carol Wall, "A Case Study of Periodical Mutilation in a University Serials Collection." Library & Archival Security 10 no.1 (1990): 35-41.

Bahr, Alice Harrison, "The Theif in Our Midst." Library & Archival Security 9 no.3-4 (1989): 77-81.

Collver, Mitsuko, "Subsequent Demand for Ripped-Off Journal Articles." Reference Librarian no.27-28 (1989): 347-66.

Gourke, Mary Noel, and Marjorie Murfin, "Periodical Mutilation: The Insidious Disease," Library Journal 105 (September 15, 1980): 1795-7.

Greenwood, Larry and Harlley McKean, "Effective Measurement and Reduction of Book Loss in an Academic Library." Journal of Academic Librarianship 11 no.5 (1985): 275-83.

Hendrick, Clyde, and Marjorie E. Murfin. "Project Library Ripoff: A Study of Periodical Mutilation in a University Library," College & Research Libraries 45 (November 1974): 402-11.

Hines, Theodore, "Theft, Mutilation, and the Loss-To-Use Ratio," Library Security Newsletter 1 (May 1975): 1-4.

Murfin, Marjorie, and Clyde Hendrick, "Ripoffs Tell Their Story: Interviews With Mutilators in a University Library." Journal of Academic Librarianship 1 (May 1975): 8-12.

Petersen, Terri, "Theft and Mutilation of Library Materials," College & Research Libraries 51 (March 1990): 120-8.

Towner, Lawrence W., "An End to Innocence." American Libraries 19 (March 1988): 210-13.

Wall, Carol, "Inventory: What You Might expect To Be Missing." Library & Archival Security 7 no.2 (Summer 1985): 27-31.

Weiss, Dana, "Book Theft and Book Mutilation in a Large Urban University Library," College & Research Libraries 42 (July 1981): 341-7.